

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 5 – 12, 18, and 20 – 25 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 18, 20, 21, and 22 have been amended, and **together with the amendments of June 15, 2007**, are presented for re-examination in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claim 25 is newly presented for a first action on the merits, but merely recites subject matter originally present in claim 9, but have now been deleted therefrom.

After entering the amendments and remarks of June 15, 2007, the Examiner issued an Office Communication (hereinafter “the September 7 Office Communication”), in which the Examiner requested that arguments be presented pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render newly added claims 23 and 24 patentable over the applied references; and in which the Examiner reiterated that all antecedent basis omissions must be corrected in the claims, including at least errors identified in claims 1 and 9.

Regarding claims 23 and 24, applicant respectfully notes that these claims merely restate the content of claims 15 and 17, which were indicated as allowable by the Examiner in the March 15, 2007 Office Action, pending their placement sequentially *after* claim 18, from which they were previously amended to depend. Thus, Claims 23 and 24 are allowable for the same specific distinctions which rendered claims 15 and 17 previously allowable by the Examiner. Moreover, claims 23 and 24 are hereby argued to be further patentable over the cited art of record at least for their dependence from allowable claim 18.

Regarding the Examiner’s noted antecedent basis issues, Applicants respectfully submit that they have carefully reviewed the claims, have located every use of an article “a,” “an,” “the,” or “said,” and have corrected any antecedent basis errors uncovered, including at least those noted by the Examiner in the September 7 Office communication. All claims have been amended to utilize consistent and disambiguating nomenclature, such as “outgoing service packets” and “incoming service packets,” and “a specific one of said signaling functions” and

“said specific one or another of said signaling functions.” The Examiner’s concerns over the phrase “the following” have been obviated by the removal of this term from all claims.

Further, the Examiner’s antecedent basis concerns in Claim 9, which stemmed from that claim’s recitation of two alternative features each comprising the term “frames,” have been addressed by the cancellation of one of these features, which has been reintroduced in new claim 25. New claim 25 is thus submitted to be allowable for reciting a feature of allowable claim 9, and for its dependence from an allowable claim. Since claim 9 originally recited two fully alternative features, it is submitted that amended claim 9 and new claim 25, each independently reciting a respective one of these features, do not differ in scope from original claim 9, and introduce no new matter to the application.

Should the Examiner identify any further errors in antecedent basis, **the Examiner is hereby authorized, without the need of further contact by the Examiner, to enter an Examiner’s Amendment to correct any cases where antecedent basis are lacking.**

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments overcome all of the Examiner’s objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 and 112, second paragraph, and, together with the amendments of June 15, 2007, address all of the Examiner’s concerns in the Office Action of March 15, 2007, and the September 7 Office communication. As no other rejections are outstanding, Applicants submit that the present claims and application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner’s continued rejections are requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney.

Supplemental Response to Office Action of March 15, 2007
in view of Office communication of September 7, 2007

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. Charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 14-0112.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 9, 2007
THE NATH LAW GROUP
112 South West Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 548-6284

By:



Harold L. Novick
Registration No. 26,011
Matthew J. Moffa
Registration No. 58,860
Customer No. 20529